

United States Department of Agriculture,

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY.

C. L. ALSBERG, Chief of Bureau.

SERVICE AND REGULATORY ANNOUNCEMENTS. SUPPLEMENT.

N. J. 8851-8900.

[Approved by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., May 3, 1921.]

NOTICES OF JUDGMENT UNDER THE FOOD AND DRUGS ACT.

[Given pursuant to section 4 of the Food and Drugs Act.]

8851. Misbranding of Dr. King's Liver and Kidney Alterative and Blood Tonic. U. S. * * * v. Charles A. Ritchey (King Medicine Co.).
Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 9786. I. S. No. 12047-p.)

On December 31, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Charles A. Ritchey, trading as the King Medicine Co., Chicago, Ill., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about June 6, 1918, from the State of Illinois into the State of Louisiana, of a quantity of Dr. King's Liver and Kidney Alterative and Blood Tonic which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part, "Manufactured by King Medicine Co., 3757 Sheffield Avenue, Chicago, Ill."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of a dark colored aqueous solution containing essentially magnesium sulphate with a small amount of plant material and salicylic acid.

It was alleged in substance in the information that the article was misbranded for the reason that certain statements regarding the therapeutic or curative effects thereof, appearing on the label, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a liver and kidney alterative and blood tonic, to act on the liver, kidneys, and blood, to renovate and enrich the blood, to have a specific action on the liver [and] kidneys, to invigorate weak and debilitated liver and kidneys, as a relief for indigestion and as a treatment, remedy, and cure for indigestion, and for rheumatism that comes from impure blood and a run-down system, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On March 23, 1920, the defendant entered a plea of not guilty to the information. On December 15, 1920, the defendant withdrew the plea of not guilty and entered a plea of guilty, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*